Application No. 09/475,447   Attorney Docket No. RCA 89,894
<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 11, 13-20 and 22-26 remain pending in this application with claims 11, 16 20, 24 and 25 being amended by this response.

<u>Rejection of Claims 11, 13-20 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)</u>

Claims 11, 13-20 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Collings (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402) in view of Casement (U.S. Patent No. 5,969,748).

The present claimed invention recites a system for selectably controlling viewing and recording of television programs. The system includes at least one viewer profile establishing a set of limits for blocking images outside said limits from view. At least one limit is selected from the group including: program ratings, spending, channel, view time limits, time of day limits, image content ratings. The present invention also provides for at least one override list including at least one override instruction applicable to the included at least one viewer profile. A conflict resolver is provided for detecting the existence of a conflict between override instructions and automatically resolve conflicts between override instructions upon detecting the existence of a conflict. Independent Claims 11, 16 20, 24 and 25 each contain limitation similar to those described above and thus all arguments presented below apply to each of those claims.

Collings describes a system and method for blocking the reception of television programming which meets specified criteria. Data packets describing television programming are broadcast with the television signal. The data packets include at least packets which contain category information specifying a level in one or more multi-level categories and/or label information specifying labels applied to the program content of the signal. Data packets in an incoming video signal are detected by a blocking apparatus and compared to preferences stored in non-volatile memory in the blocking apparatus. If the contents of the data packets match or exceed the stored

- 6 -

Application No. 09/475,447   Attorney Docket No. RCA 89,894

preferences, then the video signal is blocked. The methods of Collings allow several different rating systems to be used simultaneously. The system includes a menu which allows the features of apparatus 20 to be individually enabled or disabled. Each of the features listed beside options [1] to [6] of menu 90 can be set to On, Sleep (for a specified time period) or Off. If Sleep is selected the feature will be disabled for a period of time designated by the "Sleep Time" (Column 17, lines 9-18). Additionally, a user may simply disable one or more individual features from the list of menu choices. Collings, however, as admitted in the Office Action, neither discloses nor suggests "a conflict resolver for detecting the existence of a conflict between override instructions and <u>automatically resolving conflicts</u> between said override instructions upon detecting the existence of a conflict when said set of limits are enabled" as in the present claimed invention.

Although, the Office Action agrees that Collings fails to disclose detecting the existence of a conflict and automatically resolving upon detecting the existence of a conflict. However, the Office Action contends that, in analogous art, Casement discloses detecting the existence of a conflict and automatically resolving conflicts upon detecting the existence of a conflict for the purpose of preventing a conflict of previous scheduled functions. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Casement describes a television schedule system with a user interface which allows a user to control access to television programs by time, rating, content, and/or channel. A user with a password enters the criteria for blocking television programs from being viewed. A television program listing is selected for viewing or recording from an on-screen program guide. A viewer is prompted on the screen to enter a password if the selected program meets the blocking criterion. If the viewer enters the appropriate password, the selected program that meets the blocking criterion is unblocked. However, Casement, similarly to Collings, neither discloses nor suggests "<u>automatically resolving conflicts</u> between said override instructions upon detecting the existence of a conflict when said set of limits are enabled" as in the present claimed invention.

- 7 -

Application No. 09/475,447   Attorney Docket No. RCA 89,894

The system of Casement is able to determine whether a current or future program is shown on a restricted channel as well as whether a program falls within a restricted rating and/or content, V-chip classification, or time period. In the event a channel on which programs are desired to be viewed or scheduled for recording is restricted, a pop-up will appear warning the user of the conflict. If the user ignores the pop-up, the channel will be locked. However, if the correct password is supplied, the user may view the channel or schedule recording of future programs. Casement is not concerned with conflicts between <u>overrides</u>. Casement is concerned with detecting whether a program desired to be viewed or recorded is blocked by a present ratings limit. In order to allow the desired program to be viewed or recorded, Casement requires a user response to a pop-up window by either inputting a password to allow viewing or recording, or ignoring the window whereby the channel is then locked from viewing or recording. Casement is not concerned with conflicts between overrides let alone "<u>automatically resolving conflicts</u> between said override instructions upon detecting the existence of a conflict when said set of limits are enabled" as in the present claimed invention.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Collings and Casement, when taken alone or in combination showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that claims 11, 16, 20, 24 and 25 are not anticipated by Haris or Moed when taken alone or in combination. Since claims 13-15, 17-19, 22-23 and 26 are dependant on independent claims 11, 16, 20 and 25 respectfully, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11, 16, 20 and 25. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

The applicant respectfully submits, in view of the above arguments, that the all arguments made by the Examiner have been addressed and this rejection should be withdrawn. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the present claimed invention is patentable.

- 8 -

Application No. 09/475,447   Attorney Docket No. RCA 89,894

No additional fee is believed due. However, if an additional fee is due, please

charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
David Johnston Lynch

By: Jack Schwartz
Reg. No. 34,721
Tel. No. (609) 734-6866

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
November 1, 2005

P. 10 **